

the genus *Sambucus*, all fossil species, as well as any species of elder yet to be evolved.

Many of the interpretations of botanical data listed under the heading of "Extensions of Meanings of New Genera" (p. clxxv) are entirely misleading, as, for instance, when Lewis is said to have used the word *beech* in a new sense for the common lowland alder (*Alnus rubra*) of the Pacific slope. Actually, this is what Lewis wrote: "The stem of the black alder arrives to a great size. It is simple, branching, and diffuse; the bark is smooth, of a light colour, with white spreading spots, *resembling those of the beech.*" (italics mine). Clearly, Lewis was *not* using the term in a new generic sense; he was merely comparing the tree he was describing (alder) with another kind of tree (beech) with which he was familiar in eastern North America. The curious reader may supply himself with a considerable number of other instances of this sort. The author also gives tables of words supposed to have been used by Lewis & Clark long before they were used by anyone else, including such names as white oak, ironwood, white walnut, red cedar, arrowwood, slippery elm, tamarack, etc. Actually, these names appeared in botanical works many years earlier. For example, some of them appear in the English edition of Peter Kalm's (1749-50) *Travels into North America* by J. R. Forster in 1770, while others were used by Michaux, Bigelow, Aiton, and other botanists some years before the publication of the Lewis & Clark Journal.

There is no need of citing additional examples from this plethora of scientific inaccuracies. It is obvious that the author has gone somewhat beyond his depth. It is a pity that the science of systematic botany has to bear the burden of such unripe scholarship. In conclusion, it can be pointed out that, although *Lewis & Clark: Linguistic Pioneers* may contain some material of value to lexicographers, it scarcely can be regarded as an authoritative source of botanical information, or even as a reliable commentary on the linguistic peculiarities of the Lewis & Clark Journals.—GEORGE NEVILLE JONES, University of Illinois.

NAPAEA DIOICA IN NEW ENGLAND.—On August 24, 1940, while collecting along the "River Road", Lewiston, Vermont (Norwich railroad station), I found a clump of tall malvaceous plants growing beside an old cellar-hole three-fifths of a mile north of the Hanover bridge. A specimen was collected in the belief that it was an escape from cultivation, and by comparison with specimens in the Jesup Herbarium at Dartmouth College was identified as *Napaea dioica* L. The identification has been checked by Mr. C. A. Weatherby of the Gray Herbarium, from material subsequently sent to him. Further investigation at the original site disclosed two more clumps, in rather dry, sandy soil, one less than ten feet from the B. & M. railroad tracks, which lie in a cut just behind the cellar-hole. One clump con-

sisted only of long-petioled basal leaves, but the other two had about thirty flowering stems apiece, some five feet high with large diffuse panicles. The flowers were just coming into bloom when the plant was first seen, considerably later than the "July" of manuals. Only staminate plants have been collected.

According to the manuals, this plant is restricted to the limestone valleys of the Alleghenies, southwestern Pennsylvania to Virginia, and bottom lands in Ohio and Illinois to Minnesota. The species has been reported as an escape in the Arnold Arboretum¹; it is apparently not otherwise known from New England. Gray's *Synoptical Flora of North America* (1895) says it is "rare, but . . . sometimes cultivated"; it is not, however, given in Bailey's *Manual of Cultivated Plants*, and it is doubtful if the plant has been widely cultivated in this region. Its appearance here might be ascribed to distribution by the railroad. The luxuriance of the growth indicates that the plant is well established and there seems no reason why it should not persist indefinitely.—JOHN P. BROWN, Dartmouth College, Hanover, New Hampshire.

MOSS FLORA OF NORTH AMERICA NORTH OF MEXICO.—With the recent issue of Volume II, Part 4, Dr. A. J. Grout brings this monumental work to a successful conclusion. The three volumes, in four parts each, together with Dr. Grout's "Mosses with a Hand Lens and Microscope" make up a manual which should be sufficient for the American and Canadian Bryologist unless he is engaged in monographic or serious research work. The present section is by Dr. A. Le Roy Andrews and completes his treatment of the Bryaceae begun in Vol. II, Part 3. Besides this Dr. Andrews also covers the Mniaceae and the Rhizogoniaceae. The genera treated are *Bryum*, *Rhodobryum*, *Mnium*, *Cinclidium* and *Rhizogonium*. No section of the book will be more welcome to bryologists than this which brings together the confusing and cumbersome genus, *Bryum*, into a unified and apparently intelligible whole. Besides his editing of the entire work Dr. Grout has prepared artificial keys to *Pohlia* and *Bryum* based, as far as possible, on gametophyte characteristics. These keys are a very welcome addition to the more formal keys whose main distinctions are based on the sporophyte. Publication of this work was started in 1928 and every American bryologist owes Dr. Grout and his collaborators his thanks for the energetic manner in which it has been carried through to the end.—D. L. ORDWAY.

¹ E. J. Palmer, Journ. Arn. Arb. xi. 106 (1930).